

# BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

August 14, 2003

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Mimi Doukas called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

**ROLL CALL:** Present were Chairman Mimi Doukas; Board Members Cecilia Antonio, Hal Beighley, Ronald Nardoza, and Stewart Straus. Board Members Jennifer Shipley and Jessica Weathers were excused.

Development Services Manager Steven Sparks, Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson, and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

## **VISITORS:**

Chairman Doukas read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

## **OLD BUSINESS:**

### **CONTINUANCES:**

Chairman Doukas opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the hearing. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date.

## **I. ORCHARD GLEN CONDOMINIUMS**

### **A. DR 2003-0076 – DESIGN REVIEW**

### **B. ADJ 2003-0008 – MAJOR ADJUSTMENT**

The applicant requests Design Review approval of a 106-unit residential development, including 38 detached single-family condominium residences, eight four-plexes, 36 row house units, associated open spaces, Summer Creek corridor enhancement, and public facility improvements. In addition, the applicant

requests Major Adjustment approval to adjust Development Code Section 20.05.50.E.3, reducing the required minimum separation between buildings from eight feet to six feet. The property is located at 16101 SW Barrows Road, and can be more specifically identified as Tax Lot 6800 (at the time of application) on Washington County Assessor's Map 2S1-05BC. The property is zoned R-2 Urban Medium Density.

Observing that she is employed by *WRG Design Group*, who represents the applicant, *Centex Homes*, with regard to this proposal, Chairman Doukas recused herself from participating in this hearing, turned the gavel over to Vice-Chairman Beighley, and left the dais.

Vice-Chairman Beighley provided a brief description of the Public Hearing process and asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda.

Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson presented the Staff Reports and described the applications associated with this proposal. Referring to page 1 of the Staff Report for ADJ 2003-0008, he noted that the listed approval criteria should be amended, as follows: "Development Code, Section 40.20~~10~~.15.3.C. He provided the materials board and discussed issues regarding access, pedestrian connectivity, parking, and open spaces, as well as the various types of homes, designs, and color schemes included in this proposal and the proposed elimination of Condition of Approval No. 20, which pertains to roofline breaks, for the application DR 2003-0076. Concluding, he recommended approval of both applications and offered to respond to questions.

#### **APPLICANT:**

**MIMI DOUKAS**, representing *WRG Design Group*, on behalf of the applicant, *Centex Homes*, distributed additional handouts providing information with regard to this proposal, and introduced Dave Cady and Andy Tiemann, both of whom represent *Centex Homes*; Randy Dyer, representing *WRG Design Group*; and Brian Wilkinson. Observing that this property is located in the northeast corner of SW Scholls Ferry Road and SW Barrows Road, she described challenges associated with this site, observing that it had not been possible to create single-family homes on this site while meeting the density requirements. She discussed the various four-plex and five-plex homes and condominiums available through this development, and mentioned a creek that exists along SW Barrows Road, noting that improvements would be made to this creek that currently resembles a roadside ditch.

She described the various access points associated with this proposal, noting that although it had been necessary to remove a second access through the Facilities Review Process, emergency access would still be available at this point. Concluding, she expressed her opinion that although the condominiums are a little unusual, they provide a good solution for this site.

**DAVE CADY**, representing *Centex Homes*, discussed the nature and quality of the homes that would be provided and described the type of atmosphere the applicant is attempting to create, emphasizing the proposed enhancement of the Summer Creek corridor.

6:58 p.m. – Development Services Manager Steven Sparks arrived.

Mr. Cady discussed the aesthetics and architectural aspects of the development, including elevations, structural features, topography, and color schemes, as well as the various amenities, including the active and passive areas, playground, and open spaces. On question, he advised Ms. Antonio that the roofline had been broken up in order to satisfy the requirement with regard to Condition of Approval No. 20, and expressed his opinion that it is not necessary to eliminate Condition of Approval No. 20.

**ANDY TIEMANN**, Project Manager representing *Centex Homes*, discussed certain issues involving Condition of Approval No. 20, observing that the intent had been to add the revised elevation indicating that the gables had been removed and illustrating the grade breaks.

Mr. Ryerson explained that the original intent of Condition of Approval No. 20 had been to break up the roofline and mitigate the effect of a large mass of a building, noting that other options had been discussed, including a potential roofline break.

Ms. Doukas observed that the applicant prefers to retain Condition of Approval No. 20, adding that this provides some flexibility to work with staff to make certain that there would be some sort of break or variation in the roofline. She discussed the proposed shared alleyway and shared drive, noting that the streetscape along SW Barrows Road would actually be building facades, rather than garages, expressing her opinion that this would create a more attractive streetscape and a better sense of community. Concluding, she referred to the limited number of opportunities to provide access to SW Scholls Ferry Road, discussed the staircase that would be necessary to address the grading

issues, discussed concerns with regard to Condition of Approval No. 15 pertaining to signage, and offered to respond to questions.

Mr. Ryerson noted that staff recommends the elimination of Condition of Approval No. 15, observing that any signage would require the administrative sign review process.

Mr. Nardozza noted that he has concerns with the two playground areas, adding that from a safety standpoint, it would be best to put these areas together.

Mr. Straus referred to the adjustment issue.

Ms. Doukas clarified that the adjustment request involves a reduction of the building separation between the single-family detached homes to six feet, noting that this does meet Building Code and is typical for this type of density.

Mr. Straus questioned whether windows are provided on the sides of these units.

Mr. Doukas clarified that there are two small windows between the single-family detached homes and the nine units on the eastern edge.

Mr. Cady emphasized that the space is closer to six feet, adding that some flexibility would be allowed, noting that they are not intended for access and that they meet the Fire Code.

Mr. Straus mentioned the landscaping proposed between these units.

Mr. Cady explained that the landscaping is included in the original plan submittal and that the applicant has built these units before.

Ms. Doukas noted that shrubs would be provided between the walkways on the front end of the project.

Mr. Straus pointed out that there are issues regarding maintenance, lighting, and safety in the narrow spaces between the buildings.

Ms. Doukas advised Mr. Straus that staff has included a Condition of Approval providing that no fences shall be installed between the units.

Observing that the area would be maintained by a Homeowner's Association, Mr. Cady pointed out that landscaping would be

somewhat difficult due to solar access because of the closeness of the building and required density.

Mr. Straus questioned whether there is any provision for fencing between the adjoining yards to provide privacy between the yards.

Ms. Doukas noted that some fencing is proposed in this area.

Mr. Cady referred to Sheet L-2, specifically Building 230-229.

Ms. Doukas noted that Sheet C-10 provides a wall and fence plan, observing that this involves what she referred to as a balancing act.

Mr. Cady discussed a detailed illustration showing typical gate locations for detached units, noting that it is slightly easier to see the little short sections of fence that provide some autonomy and security to the back yard areas.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

**JOHN HOLEWA** mentioned that his home is located immediately south of SW Barrows Road and directly across the street from the proposal, observing that he is here with several neighbors to express his objections. He explained that he is concerned with property values, noise issues, traffic issues, and public safety, particularly when added to the massive development that is already occurring in the area, and pointed out that he believes that this proposal is inconsistent with the existing neighborhood and would destroy the quality of life that the residents have become accustomed to.

**GUY HAYNES** pointed out that he lives directly across from the area described as Area "A" on the proposed development, adding that he has several specific concerns with regard to this proposal. He noted out that 100 additional homes in this small area would generate a great deal of additional traffic, emphasizing that he feels this would create issues with regard to public safety and crime, in addition to decreasing the value of other properties in the area. He provided several suggestions with regard to improving the safety of the area, including additional signage and blinking lights, expressing his opinion that the developer should be required to install some type of a traffic barricade to provide some protection and privacy for his home and neighborhood.

**AMY McGINNIS** explained that her home is located in the Autumn Crest development, observing that while she accepts that this property

needs to be developed, she is concerned with the traffic on SW Barrows Road, decreasing property values, and the location of the play area.

7:33 p.m. – Mr. Sparks left.

**APPLICANT REBUTTAL:**

Ms. Doukas discussed concerns with regard to property values, observing that while this is the nature of development and that the entire community struggles with this issue, these are brand new quality condominium homes created by *Centex Homes*. Referring to concerns expressed with regard to traffic issues, she emphasized that the applicant would make every effort to address and resolve these issues. Emphasizing that safety would be preserved through various mitigation measures, including bicycle lanes and sidewalks, she mentioned the traffic speed study conducted by *Kittelson & Associates*, pointing out that the majority of the traffic currently travels within the posted 45 mph. speed limit. Concluding, she noted that the play structure issue had already been addressed and offered to respond to questions.

Ms. Antonio referred to Mr. Haynes' concerns with regard to traffic on Street "A".

Mr. Cady pointed out that no more than 24 of the 106 units would be utilizing Street "A".

Ms. Antonio expressed her opinion that 24 homes involves a lot of vehicles, and questioned the possibility of installing larger trees in that area to create both shading and foliage.

Observing that there had been concern with viewing the side of a unit, Mr. Cady explained that the landscape plan includes trees and street trees that would be planted along the right-of-way. He emphasized that it is a challenge to balance between the development and the Fire Marshal's requirements with regard to emergency vehicle access.

Ms. Doukas noted that the six-inch curb at the end of the street should deter drivers utilizing Street "A" as a short cut.

Mr. Cady pointed out that bollards would be installed to provide barriers, adding that only emergency vehicles would have access.

Ms. Doukas discussed the necessity of meeting access requirements.

Ms. Antonio mentioned the neighbor's request for a wall behind the houses on the side of the street on the south side of SW Barrows Road.

Ms. Doukas advised Ms. Antonio that this would not be feasible because it would involve establishing a precedent of providing improvements on somebody else's property, adding that SW Barrows Road has been classified as a collector street for quite some time. Observing that the Progress Quarry development would include the extension of SW Murray Boulevard, she pointed out that while she is not certain just how this would change the traffic patterns in this area, she has a hunch that the situation would improve.

Mr. Ryerson mentioned that with the Progress Quarry development occurring to the east, another connection would be occurring to the north of that site, adding that this connection involves the brownstone homes at SW Scholls Ferry Road. He confirmed that the minimum density is 99 units and the maximum density is 124 units, noting that the 106 units proposed are closer to the minimum and that this property has been zoned for this higher density for some time. Concluding, he pointed out that this proposal meets requirements while providing a variety of housing options, expressing his opinion that the applicant had managed to minimize impacts to the surrounding properties and recommended approval of both applications.

Vice-Chairman Beighley suggested to staff that Mr. Haynes' remarks should be shared with appropriate traffic staff and the Police Department.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Ms. Antonio **SECONDED** a motion to **APPROVE** ADJ 2003-0008 – Orchard Glen Condominiums – Major Adjustment, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearings on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated August 7, 2003, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 3.

Motion for approval **CARRIED**, by the following vote:

<b>AYES:</b>	Straus, Antonio, Nardozza, and Beighley.
<b>NAYS:</b>	None.
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	Doukas.
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Shipley and Weathers.

Motion for approval **CARRIED**, by the following vote:

**AYES:** Straus, Antonio, Nardozza, and Beighley.  
**NAYS:** None.  
**ABSTAIN:** Doukas.  
**ABSENT:** Shipley and Weathers.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Ms. Antonio **SECONDED** a motion to **APPROVE** DR 2003-0076 – Orchard Glen Condominiums Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearings on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated August 7, 2003, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 24, with the deletion of Condition of Approval No. 15, as follows:

~~15. No A-frame signs or other incidental signs, price signs, “open” or “closed” signs, flags or banners, or special product advertising shall be erected on a permanent or temporary basis. No window signs in excess of 20% of the window area are permitted at any time.~~

Vice-Chairman Beighley questioned whether it is necessary to stipulate that the play area should be relocated.

Mr. Nardozza suggested that this should be left up to the discretion of the applicant.

Motion for approval **CARRIED**, by the following vote:

**AYES:** Straus, Antonio, Nardozza, and Beighley.  
**NAYS:** None.  
**ABSTAIN:** Doukas.  
**ABSENT:** Shipley and Weathers.

Chairman Doukas returned to the dais and reclaimed the gavel from Vice-Chairman Beighley.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes of June 26, 2003, as written, were submitted. Chairman Doukas asked if there were any changes or corrections. Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Beighley **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously, with the exception of Chairman Doukas, Ms. Antonio and Mr. Nardozza, who abstained from voting on this issue.



The minutes of July 17, 2003, as written, were submitted. Chairman Doukas asked if there were any changes or corrections. Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Nardozza **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously, with the exception of Chairman Doukas, who abstained from voting on this issue.

The minutes of July 31, 2003, as written, were submitted. Observing that she had been the only member of the Board of Design Review in attendance at this meeting, Ms. Doukas **APPROVED** the minutes as written and submitted.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

The meeting adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

#### *CALENDAR*

<i>October</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>6:30 p.m.</i>	<i>Continuance</i>	<i>DR 2003-0005</i>	<i>Canyon T.C. Retail Building</i>
			<i>Public Hearing</i>	<i>DR 2003-0024</i>	
				<i>ADJ 2003-0003</i>	
				<i>ADJ 2003-0004</i>	
				<i>LLA 2003-0006</i>	<i>Crescent Hill Apartments III</i>
<i>Nov.</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>6:30 p.m.</i>	<i>Continuance</i>	<i>BDR 2002-0172</i>	
				<i>VAR 2002-0010</i>	<i>Westpark Center Development</i>